

### **REMARKS**

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the present application. No new matter has been added to the present application. Claims 1-29 have been canceled and new claims 30-47 have been added in this Amendment. Accordingly, claims 30-47 are pending herein. Claims 30-47 are believed to be in condition for allowance upon review and acceptance of these remarks. Favorable action is respectfully requested.

#### **Rejections based on 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) and 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)**

Claims 1-29 were previously rejected based primarily on Minyard and Rothschild. These claims have been canceled, and new claims 30-47 have been presented herein for consideration. Applicants respectfully submit that new claims 30-47 recite features that are not described, taught, or suggested by the cited references.

Each of independent claims 30, 36, and 42 include features directed to managing the transfer of studies from a study process server to a review station. Studies acquired at acquisition devices are provided to the study process server, which sorts the studies into a number of working sets. A subset of studies is selected from a working set and transferred from the study process server to a review station. The review station is then monitored to determine when a clinician begins to review the subset of studies from the working set at the review station. When clinician review of the subset of studies from the working set is detected at the review station, additional studies from that working set are transferred to the review station.

Minyard and Rothschild, either alone or in combination, fail to describe, teach or suggest the features of sorting studies into working sets, sending only a subset of studies from a working set to a review station, monitoring for clinician review of the subset of studies from the working set at the review station, and then transferring additional studies from that working set

to the review station when physician review of the subset is detected at the review station as in independent claims 30, 36, and 42. Instead, Minyard and Rothschild teach an all or nothing approach. In particular, the approaches discussed in the references include either: (1) pushing all images from a working set to a review station and caching the images at the review station; or (2) not pushing any images to a review station but instead sending the images to a review station upon the occurrence some event (e.g., upon login). As such, the references do not discuss the concept of sending only a subset of studies from a working set to a review station and then sending additional studies from the working set to the review station when clinician review of the subset at the review station is detected.

The inventions of claims 30, 36, and 42 provide significant advantages over the approaches discussed in the cited references. In particular, the claimed inventions allow studies to be distributed from a central server to review stations in a manner that provides for immediate access to a subset of the studies without creating excessive network traffic and consuming excessive memory resources. By providing a subset of studies from a working set to be readily available for review at a review station, a clinician may immediately begin reviewing the studies from the subset. Additionally, because only a subset of the studies from the working set are initially transferred (as opposed to all studies), excessive network traffic is avoided and excessive memory resources are not consumed. When a clinician begins reviewing the subset of studies from the working set at a review station, the system recognizes that the subset of studies from the working set are being reviewed and begins distributing other studies in the working set to the review station.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that independent claims 30, 36, and 42 are patentable over the art of record. Dependent claims 31-35, 37-41, and 43-47 are also allowable for at least the reasons provided above.

## CONCLUSION

For at least the reasons stated above, claims 30-47 are now in condition for allowance. Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the pending rejections and allowance of the claims. If any issues remain that would prevent issuance of this application, the Examiner is urged to contact the undersigned – 816-474-6550 or [jgolian@shb.com](mailto:jgolian@shb.com) (such communication via email is herein expressly granted) – to resolve the same. The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any amount required, or refund any applicable amount, to Deposit Account No. 19-2112.

Respectfully submitted,

/John S. Golian/

John S. Golian  
Reg. No. 54,702

SHOOK, HARDY & BACON L.L.P.  
2555 Grand Blvd.  
Kansas City, MO 64108-2613  
816-474-6550